

## REMARKS

Claims 1-49 have been examined.

**Alleged indefiniteness.** Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 28-30, 34-35, and 43 are rejected as allegedly indefinite (Office Action paragraph 2) because of the use of "e.g.". Each of these claims has been amended to eliminate the offending language.

**Allowable subject matter.** The Examiner states (Office Action paragraph 3) that claim 6 would be allowable if recast in independent form. Claim 6 has recast accordingly (incorporating the limitations of claim 1 from which it depends), and allowance is requested.

It is noted that no art has been cited against claim 27. It is thus understood that claim 27 is allowable, and allowance of this claim is requested. Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27 and thus include all of its limitations, and thus allowance of claims 28-30 is also requested.

It is noted that no art has been cited against claim 41. It is thus understood that claim 41 is allowable if recast in independent form. Claim 41 has recast accordingly (incorporating the limitations of claims 31, 39 and 40 from which it depends), and thus allowance of claim 41 is requested. Claims 42-44 depend from claim 41 and thus include all of its limitations, and thus allowance of claims 42-44 is also requested.

**Rejections over two-way combination of Twitchell and Carrender.** Claims 7-11, 28-30, 32 and 35 are rejected as allegedly obvious in view of a two-way combination of Twitchell and US Pat. No. 6,927,687 to Carrender ("Carrender"). The Examiner expresses the view that

it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to incorporate the teaching [of] Carrender, with the system of Twitchell...

It is noted that the present application claims priority from US application number 60/461,562, filed April 9, 2003. The undersigned, however, is unaware of any facts suggesting that Carrender was anything other than secret within USPTO until it was published on January 15, 2004. Thus it appears to the undersigned that it was simply impossible for anyone to incorporate the teaching of Carrender with the system of Twitchell prior to January 15, 2004. In other words it is irrelevant whether such a combination would have been obvious or not, and irrelevant whether the would-be combiner was "of ordinary skill in the art", because the Carrender reference was not available prior to that date.


It is important, too, to bear in mind that the present application claims priority from, and is substantively identical to, prior US application number 60/461,562, filed April 9, 2003. That date predates the date upon which Carrender was for the first time released from secrecy within the USPTO. Thus the rejection should be withdrawn.

For this reason, claims 7-10, 12-14, 32 and 35 have been recast in independent form.

**Rejections over Twitchell taken alone.** Claims 1, 3, 12-26, 33-34, 36-40 and 42-49 are rejected (Office Action paragraph 5) as allegedly lacking novelty with respect to US Pat. No. 6,745,027 to Twitchell, Jr. ("Twitchell"). Claims 2-5 and 31 are rejected (Office Action paragraph 7) as allegedly obvious in view of Twitchell.

Claims 1-5, 12-26, 31, 37-40 and 45-49 have been canceled, in favor of a continuation to be filed at a later time.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Carl Oppedahl  
PTO Reg. No. 32,746  
Oppedahl & Larson LLP  
P O Box 5088  
Dillon, CO 80435-5088  
telephone 970 468 6600

BEST AVAILABLE COPY